

General Plan Program Citizens' Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting #13 – May 17, 2004

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the General Plan program held its thirteenth and final meeting on Monday May 17, 2004 at 5:00 p.m. in the Mayor's Ceremonial Room on the 7th floor of Riverside City Hall. Attendees were as follows:

CAC Members

David Leonard
Sally Silva
Brigadier General Stan Brown
George Flower
Mike Teer
Maureen Kane
Morgan Keith
Judy Teunissen
Barry Johnson
Maynard Lowry
Kimberly Davidson-Morgan
Tom Pevehouse
Bill Warkentin
Colleen McBride
Matt Webb
David McNiel

Other interested parties in attendance

Dennis Garcia
Bob Garcia
Ed Martinez
James Hernandez
Mary Humboldt

City Staff

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director
Craig Aaron, Principal Planner
Diane Jenkins, AICP, Senior Planner
Patricia Brenes, Associate Planner
Robert Laag, Planning Intern
Susan Wilson, Deputy City Attorney

Consultant Team

Laura Stetson, Cotton/Bridges/Associates
John Cook, Cotton/Bridges/Associates

Larry Morrison, The Arroyo Group
Jean D'Agostino, The Arroyo Group

Introductory Remarks

Laura Stetson stated that there were three main issues to consider at this meeting: reviewing the draft General Plan elements, seeking public comment, and considering next steps. With regard to the review of elements, Stetson stated that the CAC should focus on two key questions:

- 1) Does the element adequately capture and convey the necessary ideas?
- 2) Did we miss anything that should be added to the elements?

Stetson outlined each of the elements, noting key features of each. She also discussed the numerous implementation mechanisms, including the updated Zone Code, Design Guidelines, and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan. Stetson asked CAC members to indicate "burning" issues they wished to be certain to discuss during the meeting. CAC members noted the following two issues:

- Arts and Culture Element
- Need for General Plan to have a preamble addressing the lack of planning coordination between the City and the County.

Following is a summary of comments received for each of the General Plan elements, including the Introduction. Attributions are provided where noted.

INTRODUCTION

Chair Leonard:

Delete reference to "Anonymous Visioneer" to give element greater import

General Brown:

Needs to be discussion of the Riverside National Cemetery in the "Military Influence" section – has impact upon the City although outside of the City. Historically significant; attracts visitors. (Add at Page I-7) (Could also be discussion added at Historic Preservation Element)

LAND USE ELEMENT

Ms. Davidson-Morgan:

Rancho La Sierra was specifically contemplated in Measure C – should be noted as open space

Tequesquite Arroyo – should be considered as passive open space

Chair Leonard:

Page 18 Santa Ana River Policies

No guidelines to address increased accessibility and prominence of the Santa Ana River

Page 24-25

Nothing about Overlook Parkway (need to add policy consistent with the Circulation Element – specific plan level study for Overlook)

Page 34 – rehabilitation

Have a policy that says “address legal and technical barriers that inhibit code enforcement”

(Attribution not recorded)

Page 49 - Arlington BID – has already been established – just “maintain”

Mr. McNiel:

Page 60 – Mile Square is not an historic district; delete. Include other designated historic districts in discussion.

Chair Leonard:

Add policy: Maintain inventory of suitable lots for the relocation of historic residences.

Page 65 Policy LU – 44.1

Why is this here?

Policy LU 44.3 – seems to be something that should be implemented Citywide

If these are Citywide; drop both of these from particular neighborhood

(Discussion: These policies were drawn from the 1974 Eastside Community Plan and included in the Land Use Element. Mr. Webb noted that these fit under Objective LU – 44).

Mr. Teer: If the need still exists, include these policies

Resolution: Consultants will put these policies elsewhere, soften the language and make them applicable Citywide –

Ms. Davidson-Morgan:

Page 65 - Tequesquite Arroyo – CAC had previously said leave as open space

Chair Leonard:

Page 105 –Did we agree that R & C would be extended to annexation areas?

Consensus: yes.

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

General Brown:

Page 4 - Include info about Van Buren/I-215 circulation problems; Council has made an effort to annex this area; add discussion to the background

Mr. Webb:

Page 8: List alternatives we would support in addition to TriTunnel Express?
(other options: double-decking SR-91)

Diane Jenkins introduced a written comment from Tom Boyd relative to this section:
remove sentences starting at "The project would provide three tunnels"...

Chair Leonard:

Page 9, CCM-1.2 : HOV lanes may not be performing as intended – delete reference?

Diane Jenkins presented additional comments from Tom Boyd:

Re Policy CCM 1.1 – delete "Hemet/Corona/Lake Elsinore"; replace with
"Riverside to San Bernardino Corridor"

Chair Leonard

Page 15 CCM 2.3 does not reflect what CAC had agreed to; insert peak hours

Page 14 Overlook – needs to have a detailed study

Show the study area (Mary – Adams; Dufferin to SR-91 freeway)

Encourage as many connections as possible

Mr. Webb:

Overlook Bridge – how do we ensure this will be 2 lanes? (Policy CCM 4.1 shows this as 2 lanes)

Craig Aaron indicated that the planned roadway map will also show this.

Chair Leonard

Page 19: encourage RR grade separations for more efficient traffic circulation

Ms. Davidson-Morgan:

What about Central Avenue?

Chair Leonard: CC has decided not to include this.

General Brown: Committee decided to include it; should stay in.

Chair Leonard: We would like to have Central Avenue connection restored.

Mr. Teer: connection of Central would relieve congestion in area.

Chair Leonard: CAC wanted to reduce congestion at Chicago/Alessandro intersection; also public safety issue

Ms. Kane: think that committee report reflects how committee voted; wouldn't personally support connection, but CAC's recommendation should stand.

Chair Leonard:

Page 27 – Policy 10.6 – fix missing quotation marks around pedestrian friendly

Additional comments from Tom Boyd via Diane Jenkins:

Page 17 Policies 3.4 & 3.5 are potentially in conflict with each other

Page 18 Policy 4.3 – did this come from the CAC?

Ken: Policy 4.3 may be in conflict with R & C.

Mr. Webb: this was discussed in context of connecting Overlook Parkway; could this be reworded to apply more directly to Overlook? (and not generally applicable to Victoria and its intersecting streets).

General Brown:

Page 33 re: railroads

Recommendation that we talk with the largest customers of railroads that pass through the City

Ms. Davidson-Morgan: strengthen the language on railroads

HOUSING ELEMENT

Chair Leonard: why discussion of zoning?

Stetson: State law requirement that both General Plan and zoning be discussed

Ms. McBride: no information about developmentally disabled – add?

Stetson: this information isn't compiled.

ARTS AND CULTURE ELEMENT

Ms. McBride: Re Map AC -1

School for the Arts is not an existing facility

Chair Leonard:

Page 18 Policy 4.5 – what is this recommending? Did we want to have language encouraging people to incorporate art?

Stetson: policy is intentionally loose to allow for different avenues of implementation

Ms. Kane:

Policy 4.5 – 2nd sentence – starts with a non-permissive word; need to have something more permissive rather than a dictate.

Gutierrez: Arts and Culture had a stand-alone subcommittee, much like the CAC.

Arts subcommittee appointed independently with members on CAC. (Ms. Mc Bride – Arts subcommittee ; Mr. Webb – Magnolia Subcommittee)

Ms. McBride:

Public art and art in public places – different concepts. “Art in public places” can be more general (can include performance art; create a space; a gallery) – not just about “plop” art – not just about sculptures. Do not pigeonhole art forms.

AC – 4.18 call it “Master Plan for Art in Public Places” or “Spaces”

Re Information on Municipal Museum –

Other museums not discussed. Many museums in City not discussed in depth. Should not single out any institution and have policies expressly directed. could just be a line or two about each of the major facilities. Give everything else relatively equal weight

Mr. Pevehouse – need to have a brief inventory on all of our museum resources

Chair Leonard: a map of museums? Helpful to include. Sherman Institute, La Sierra each have museums

General Brown: include the March Air Museum

Mr. Flower: Cemetery is considered an “open air museum” – Judith Auth’s idea – useful in applying for funding.

EDUCATION ELEMENT

Chair Leonard:

Page 3 – UCR is no longer making a strong commitment to keeping students on campus. Land around the campus is going to be used in the future.

Larry Morrison of TAG: UCR wants to increase goal to 50%. Actual numbers today about 25%. Include discussion of UCR LRDP?

Page 13 Policy 1.7 - “housing for “educators” instead of just “teachers”

Global: use term “educators” instead of “teachers” where appropriate.

Ms. McBride:

Page 13 Policy 1.8 – why does this particular facility require a policy? Consensus: Use “Support establishment of arts-based education facilities”

Mr. Teer:

Page 15 Policy 2.10 – use “promote” instead of “Ensure”?

(Discussion: re arts policies)

Chair Leonard:

P 20 - libraries: appropriate to include discussion about funding?

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT

Chair Leonard:

Policy 4.1 - good

Policy 4.11 – say more – talk about the actual roadway improvements proposed in the Circulation Element

P 24 – Measure G – good – but appropriate for a document that will last for 20 years?

General Brown:

Page 24 - # of firestations in questions – could go back to 4

Chair Leonard – remove all discussion of Measure G

Chair Leonard:

Policy 6.3 – greater specifics? Will be addressed in zoning code.

Page 27 Policy 7.3 – add PRIVATE security forces to the list.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

Chair Leonard: lots of info from foreign studies...source?

Stetson: model AQ element from South Coast Air Quality Management District was recommended

Chair Leonard:

Policy 1.13 – begin with “Encourage” – remove reference to RFPs and RFQs

Policy 1.30 – “contaminants” has many potential definitions; “obnoxious contaminants?” – reword

Policy 1.36 – definition of “clean rail” ?

Policy 1.24 - list of these uses is “market busting”

Mr Johnson –

Policies 1.15 and 1.24 are somewhat repetitive

Stetson: delete 1.24?

Mr. Webb: Policy 1.1 – is there no existing definition of “environmental justice”?

Stetson: there are a variety of definitions – federal; state

Mr. Webb: CAC needs to go through this in more depth before signing onto what AQMD has suggested.

Mr. Pevehouse

Policy 1.3 – has a similar list as 1.24 – list of uses should be removed

Mr. Warkentin: many obnoxious qualities can be reduced/removed through good design/technology – so that uses can be more compatible.

Chair Leonard

Policy 2.18 : what is Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control System?

Craig Aaron – cameras designed to improve traffic flow.

Policy 2.23 – HOV lanes – concerned about performance of these

Policy 2.29 – concern

Craig Aaron: remove this one

Policy 1.40 – “Encourage” – “smart cars”; use clearer language

Policy 2.33/2.36/7.11 – Definition of AB 2766? What is this?

Craig Aaron: fee paid on air quality inspections – returned to cities

Policy 2.28 – By when does this need to be done.

Jenkins: there is a date by which this is required to be implemented.

Policy 3.7 – This would remove ability to adopt SOC. Suggested added language:
Encourage applicants to demonstrate features that will reduce emissions.

Policy 3.9 - Go above and beyond state codes?

Mr. Warkentin – incentives get developers to go beyond limits; would not be in favor of forcing this

(Unattributed)

Policy 3.10 : Green building codes – fold into Policy 3.9

Policy 4.2 – unpaved roads?

Mr Johnson: many dedicated residential roads in La Sierra Acres are unpaved

Gutierrez: this is mainly about PUBLIC roads.

Chair Leonard – this is about PM 10 standards

Policy 1.4 – what is “maximum feasible”?”

Jenkins: we already review projects for this under CEQA –

Stetson – remove “maximum feasible”

NOISE ELEMENT

Mr. Lowry:

Any say over routing of FedEx/ other planes over City?

Stetson: None; FAA has authority; however, you can include policies to lobby the FAA about location/timing of air routes (agreement)

OPEN SPACE/CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Chair Leonard:

P 14 – is agriculture still an “essential industry”?

Ms. Kane: this is language from Prop R/Measure C

Mr. Webb:

Figure OS 2 – Is there farmland at Overlook?

Jenkins/Stetson – these designations are based on soils; state maps.

Map needs to have source added; put note on map that clarifies

Mr. Warkentin:

Policy 1.6 – “Require the provision” sounds like a development exaction

PUBLIC FACILITIES ELEMENT

Chair Leonard:

There is a planned reduction in the extraction from the aquifer (due to contamination potential). City is going to have to import water. Need to vet this with Public Utilities

Mr. Pevehouse

P 25: section on electric power is scant; need more information about sphere areas and interconnections to the grid.

Aaron - will ask Public Utilities to look again

Chair Leonard:

Page 30: Change "medical" to "health care" – more all encompassing
General Brown: health service/health facilities lacking – detrimental to economic development.

Chair Leonard: what about having a committee to oversee health care/health care quality in the City? In Magnolia Center – CAC was encouraging lot assemblage (Topic Area 20) for medical office purposes. Staff should ensure this is included in LUE.

Ms McBride

Page 36 Where did the list of provider partners come from? ARC Riverside – needs to be included. List needs to be double-checked.

PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT

Chair Leonard:

Figure PR -1 /LU 2 – trails along Victoria end at Tequesquite – extend?

Review and Approval of Minutes, CAC Meeting of 4/12/04

Chair Leonard solicited comments and discussion on the minutes.

Ms. Davidson Morgan noted that regarding her comments on the Central Avenue extension; the minutes should reflect that she also expressed concern about the related public safety issues.

General Brown asked if the CAC discussed a beltway and if so, should it be reflected in the Circulation Element. Staff indicated that the proposed roadway system is not formally called a beltway, but will operate in a similar fashion.

Mr. McNiel moved approval of the minutes as revised. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved by acclamation.

Public Comment

James Hernandez: resident of Casa Blanca neighborhood

Issue: Overlook Avenue extension.

Kids in Casa Blanca neighborhood go to many different schools – dividing the neighborhood.

If Overlook goes through – neighborhood will be even more divided. Would need to have a traffic light on Victoria

Chair Leonard/Mr. Webb explained CAC's policy on Overlook: study needed before the bridge over the arroyo is constructed. On-ramp on Washington was not contemplated.

Dennis Garcia: Casa Blanca resident

Connecting Overlook to Madison would further divide the community – would worsen traffic in the neighborhood.

Before any decision is made: talk w/ the community and get their input

Mary Humboldt: Dufferin Avenue resident

Private efforts restored Victoria Avenue –

Victoria Avenue is a true open air museum; should be included in the Arts and Culture Element; also has educational functions – many different tree species – visited and studied by people from all over.

Over past 22 years – no other neighborhood has improved itself as much as Casa Blanca. Please don't destroy with Overlook Parkway connection.

Closing Discussion

General Brown: What assurance do we have that the GP won't gather dust?

Stetson: Program includes the Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, Design Guidelines; Implementation Plan will specify how City will implement each of the policies in GP – include responsible parties, timeframe, funding, connection to the Vision document; will be used by Council as a planning tool.

General Brown: I still think we need a preamble.

Ken: agree that greater coordination is needed – will try to mesh plan with the County. Not convinced that preamble is necessary, but can put something in the introduction.

Chair Leonard: What about a mission statement?

Mr. Pevehouse: none of us should consider that our role is over; we will need to ensure that our sentiments are acted upon.

Mr. McNiel: Pleased that comments have been incorporated well.

Agree with Tom – need to ensure that we continue to act in the future.

Ms. Kane: Important that CAC members attend the public hearings – appointees should be there to explain why things were decided.

Mr. Warkentin: much stakeholder input in this document – this goes well beyond anything we've done in the past – guts of the document are all there – I differ only in emphasis.

Zoning Code/design guidelines: there should be CAC member involvement in development and review of these.

Ken: Closing remarks – thanks to the community
JUNE 12 Citizens' Congress #2
California Baptist University
“You talked. We listened. Did we get it right?”

June 30: Magnolia Avenue Workshop – also at California Baptist

Mr. Teer: amplify General Brown's idea – mission statement is a good idea.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:12 p.m.